

Appl. No. 09/610,580
Amdt. Dated September 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0028
Customer No. 26021

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action dated June 11, 2003, which was paper # 7 of the present application. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Applicant amends claims 1 and 2 and adds claims 6-20 to more completely define the present invention. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Applicant submits that the numbering of aspects of the drawings fully complies with the rules of practice and further that amending the drawings in the manner suggested by the Examiner would violate 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). Applicant notes that the present application incorporates two other patent applications by reference and that these drawings are wholly understandable in light of the present specification and the incorporated patent applications. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 5 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,341 to Mann, et al. Claims 2 and 4 are rejected as obvious over the Mann patent taken in view of additional references. Applicant submits that the Mann patent is not related to URL forwarding and neither teaches nor suggests the applicant's system.

In a typical URL forwarding transaction, a user enters a URL (i.e., a domain name) into a browser and requests a web page. The browser initiates contact with a domain name server that translates the URL into a first IP address (i.e., represented as a set of four numbers separated by periods). Having resolved the URL into the first IP address, the user's request is directed to a first server at the first IP address. The first server analyzes the URL and, if the URL is defined for forwarding, checks a file in an associated file server to determine the second IP address to which the user's request should be directed and directs that request to

Appl. No. 09/610,580
Amdt. Dated September 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0028
Customer No. 26021

the "forwarded" second IP address. In this way, the URL forwarding system causes a URL to resolve to an IP address other than the IP address associated with the URL in the domain name system.

The present invention relates to setting up, modifying and maintaining a URL forwarding system or method. This is facilitated by, for example, use of the domain management interface described at pages 9-13 of the application. None of the references of record describe such a URL forwarding system and the presently pending claims distinguish over the references of record.

The primary reference cited against the claims is the Mann patent. The Mann patent describes a system whereby unusual or somehow desirable domain names can be automatically searched and identified as available for registration. A user fills out a request form over the Internet to submit a request to locate a domain name close to a desired name. Mann patent, col. 4, ll. 30-39. The Mann patent's system then queries the domain name system for possibly acceptable names. This is done asynchronously, that is, not in real time. Mann patent, col. 4, l. 55-col. 6, l. 21. The results of the search are returned to an individual by e-mail. Mann patent, col. 4, ll. 48-54; col. 6, ll. 22-26.

All that the Mann patent discusses is changing the registration of a domain name within the domain name system. There is no teaching in the Mann patent of a web server redirecting a URL request to an IP address other than that associated with the web server in the domain name system. In the Mann patent, a URL always resolves to the IP address stored in the domain name system. Thus, the Mann patent neither teaches nor suggests the invention defined in claim 1.

Referring to claim 1, the first URL identifies the IP address of the first web server according to the domain name system. The first web server of claim 1 redirects that URL to a second IP address for a first destination server. This would never happen in the Mann patent's system because URL's in the Mann patent's

Appl. No. 09/610,580
Amdt. Dated September 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0028
Customer No. 26021

system always resolve to the IP address stored in the domain name system. The first URL in the Mann patent would always point to the first web server and the first URL would always resolve to the IP address that is stored in the domain name system.

Consequently, claim 1 distinguishes over the Mann patent by reciting:

"a first web server adapted to receive a request for a first URL and return a message associated with the first URL request, the first URL identifying a first IP address of the first web server according to a domain name system; ... the first web server returning the second IP address as part of the message in response to the first URL request."

None of the other references of record address this deficiency of the Mann patent. As such, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-20 distinguish over the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

The art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been considered. However, it is submitted that this art neither describes nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.


Appl. No. 09/610,580
Amdt. Dated September 11, 2003
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81866.0028
Customer No. 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: September 11, 2003

By: 
William H. Wright
Registration No. 36,312
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 17 2003

OFFICIAL